



City of Carmel

CARMEL PLAN COMMISSION SPECIAL STUDIES COMMITTEE THURSDAY, APRIL 13, 2006 Minutes

Present:

Representing the Committee:

Leo Dierckman
Mark Rattermann
Madeleine Torres (arrived at 6:49p.m.)
Susan Westermeier

Representing the Department:

Christine Barton-Holmes
Matt Griffin
Mike Hollibaugh

Of Counsel:

John Molitor

Leo Dierckman called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00 PM.

The Special Studies Committee met to consider the following items:

1. Docket No. 06030018 ADLS Amend: Jameson Inn – Signage

The applicant seeks approval for two new signs.

The site is located at 10201 Meridian is zoned B-6 and is in the US Highway 31 Overlay.

Filed by Tracy from A-1 Expeditors.

The petitioner commented that the Signature Inns are changing to Jameson Inns nationwide and that Jameson Inn wants to replace the signs that are currently there.

Matt Griffin reported that the Department is recommending approval of this request as presented.

Mark Rattermann made formal motion to **approve** Docket Number **06030018 ADLS Amend: Jameson Inn – Signage, seconded by Susan Westermeier, Approved 3-0.**

...END...

2. Docket No. 06030011 ADLS Amend: Meridian Park Place- Signage

The applicant seeks approval for two new ground signs.

The site is located at 12220 N Meridian is zoned B-2 and is in the U.S. 31 Overlay.

Filed by Doug Staley Jr. for Staley Signs, Inc.

Doug Staley, Jr., Staley Signs, said that this request was occasioned by one of the signs being hit by an automobile. The petitioner would be removing the park shop sign and replacing with signs of the same size and shape. There is a slight modification to the signage and that is the changing of the color to a bronze face.

Matt Griffin reported that the Department is recommending approval as presented.

Susan Westermeier was definitely in favor of the new color of green.

Mark Rattermann made formal motion to **approve** Docket Number **06030011 ADLS Amend: Meridian Park Place-signage**, seconded by Susan Westermeier, **approved 3-0**.

...END...

3. Docket No. 06040009 ADLS Amend: Chase ATM Structure and Signage

The applicant seeks approval for the placement of an ATM kiosk and its signage.

The site is located at 200 E. Carmel Drive and is zoned B8 within the Range Line Rd./Carmel Dr. Overlay.

Filed by George Geiger of Dana Signs for Chase Bank.

George Geiger of Dana Signs appeared before the Committee representing Chase Bank. Mr. Geiger handles Chase Bank sign jurisdiction for the east coast. Mr. Geiger said that what was presented to the Committee was hypothetically what Chase was looking at. Mr. Geiger understood that there might be some conflict with the color, inasmuch as staff was suggesting a more earthy tone. Mr. Geiger noted that Chase would prefer to have the lighting on the structure for the security of the customer.

Matt Griffin commented that generally, when kiosks come through, the Department typically would like to see it tie back to the building somehow. Perhaps there is a way that the petitioner could use building materials that would be a little more toned down.

Leo Dierckmann clarified the height of the kiosk versus what existed on the site.

Matt Griffin said that the Department would rather see colors and materials that would complement the existing structure, such as earth tones and masonry.

Mark Rattermann made formal motion to approve docket number 06040009 ADLS Amend:

Chase ATM Structure and Signage, seconded by Susan Westermeier, Approved **3-0**.

...END...

4. Docket No. 06010027 ADLS Amend: CVS

The applicant seeks approval for remodeling the façade of an existing building, with integrated signage.

The site is located at 1421 Rangeline Road South and is zoned B8.

Filed by Sandra Wrobel for CVS

Petitioner's Presentation: The petitioner presented elevations to the Committee members and described changes to be made to the façade. The petitioner stated that the parking and landscaping would not change and that the existing red plastic sign would be removed and replaced by a sign inset into the proposed EIFS archway.

Department Report, Christine Barton-Holmes: The parking would not be impacted and there would be no additional square footage on site. This particular request is for a new façade only—the Department is recommending approval of the request.

The committee confirmed that the only sign would be inset into the EIFS; the petitioner agreed.

Mark Rattermann made formal **motion to approve** docket number 06010027 ADLS Amend: CVS, seconded and unanimously approved 3-0

...END...

5. Docket No. 06040010 ADLS Amend: United States Tennis Association (USTA) Signage

The applicant seeks approval for 3 new signs.

The site is located at 1310 E. 96th Street and is zoned PUD.

Filed by Andrew Schaewe of Browning Day Mullins Dierdorf Architects for the United States Tennis Association.

Andrew Schaewe with Browning Day Mullins Dierdorf Architects presented the proposed project to the Committee members.

Department Report, Matt Griffin: At this time, the Department is recommending approval of the petition.

The Committee questioned and Matt Griffin confirmed that the uses were consistent with the PUD ordinance.

Susan Westermeier made formal **motion to approve** docket number 06040010 ADLS Amend: United States Tennis Association (USTA), seconded by **Mark Rattermann**, approved **3-0**.

...END...

6. Docket No: 05120025 Z 126th & Keystone/Gramercy PUD

The applicant seeks to rezone 116 acres from R2/Residential and R4/Residential to PUD/Planned Unit Development for the purpose of creating a mixed use development comprised of townhouse, apartment, retail, and office uses.

The site is located between Carmel Drive, 126th Street, Keystone Ave, and Auman Dr. Filed by James Shinaver of Nelson & Frankenberger for Buckingham Properties Inc.

Present for the Petitioner: Jim Shinaver, Nelson and Frankenberger; Sara Nasuti and David Leazenby, Buckingham Properties.

Public Remonstrance:

An **anonymous resident** presented that the neighborhood adjacent to the proposed development was a suburban neighborhood and that the characteristics of a suburban neighborhood are what brought most of the people to the area. He said that the neighborhood consists of long time residents. He said that the Auman Addition is a great place to stroll and that the streets are used a lot by school kids. The area in question is not assured to stay close to the R-2 zoning classification standards. The North and West sides of the proposed Gramercy development are currently zoned R-2. He said that residential areas are always going to be more important than commercial areas. He said that their houses are the most important investment that most of the people in the neighborhood have. He said that he wants to know what is going on and that he thinks that there are some questions that need to be answered.

Angie Molt said that she was there representing the Auman Addition. Ms. Molt commented that the wording in Section 1 of the PUD Ordinance is very important in the event of a discrepancy. She said that in theory the language in the Gramercy PUD Ordinance sounds okay, but when one refers to the Schedule of Uses for a listing of what the residential uses are, residential uses would include single-family, two-family, attached single family, multi-family, servant's homes, boarding and lodging homes, convalescent homes, etc. Ms. Molt noted that the tallest buildings are allotted along the Keystone Corridor—perhaps there could be a gradual rise of building height to the tallest buildings in the center. Ms. Molt hoped that the tallest buildings would not be the ten stories that Buckingham was proposing. Ms. Molt asked that the building height be capped at 3-4 stories and that the businesses allowed would be in keeping with the residential character of the neighborhood—most of the neighborhoods that surround the proposed development are low-density neighborhoods. Ms. Molt discussed roof types and building heights—the building code for Carmel measures building height to the eaves. Ms. Molt commented that a majority of the uses that Buckingham is proposing are actually prohibited uses; she requested that some of those uses be removed.

Ms. Molt further commented that Buckingham wants to keep comparing the Gramercy development to what is going on in the City Center, however, the redevelopment going on down there was recapturing an old industrial area and realizes that there is a plan for the property out

there. Ms. Molt suggested that Buckingham or the City give the neighbors something that they can continue to walk on through their neighborhood. This project could set a precedent for future development in this area and Ms. Molt asked that the Committee and the City be proactive on this project.

John Sullivan, The Enclave HOA president, doesn't believe that any of the Plan Commission members live in those neighborhoods back there, but asked that the Plan Commission members drive through there. Mr. Sullivan asked that the Mohawk entrance be moved two hundred feet to the West and that traffic in the Enclave be controlled by speed bumps and gating one of the entrances. He presented results of a survey of whether the entrance should be moved or not. He asked that no construction begin within the development until the Marsh entrance was complete. Mr. Sullivan pointed out that the ordinance permits radio towers within the development. The traffic situation in the area is horrible and must be resolved—a majority of the residents in the Enclave are age sixty-five or older.

Petitioner's Presentation: David Leazenby discussed some of the recent changes that had been made specifically with respect to the Auman Addition and presented a new conceptual development plan showing more details of the proposed circulation of the site. Mr. Leazenby pointed out that they had added more plazas and open space to the more detailed plan. The calculation on the site plan that was presented is seven percent, but that there would actually be more than was shown on the plans. A list was displayed of the meetings that Buckingham Properties has had with the neighbors; the feedback received at those meetings has resulted in the changes that are reflected in the packet today. David Leazenby discussed the proposed additions and modifications to the PUD Ordinance and discussed uses that had been removed from the Permitted Uses list in the text of the PUD ordinance. The building height has been dropped down to 100 ft. and softer rooflines have been incorporated. Carmel Ordinances and regulations would prohibit entering a construction site from a residential street.

Matt Griffin said that Engineering has indicated that they are comfortable with the findings of the traffic studies and that they are in support of what is going on. The petitioner would be required to do or make monetary compensation for the road improvements in the area. The higher speed on Auman Drive would be lowered because of the increase in the number of curb cuts. Up-dating the infrastructure of the Auman neighborhood was not something that would be a scheduled event, but that it would surely happen over time. At this time there are no scheduled projects for things to be installed in the Auman neighborhood. Buckingham would like to put together the most new and improved PUD ordinance for the next meeting; Leo Dierckman's comments had been received, but they have not yet been incorporated into the version of the PUD Ordinance that was distributed tonight.

Leo Dierckman expressed continued concern with the Southern-most curb cut and asked about the status of the curb cut on Keystone.

David Leazenby responded that the request for curb cut onto Keystone has been made to INDOT and that is where it stands.

Leo Dierckman said that he cares a lot about where the commercial is going to be and requested that the petitioner submit a more detailed conceptual plan. Leo asked the petitioner to specify blocks on the new conceptual plan and to also specify what the maximum height would be. Leo said he realizes that the developer would like to maintain some flexibility, but that the Committee needs more detail to know specifically what they will end up with. Specifically, the uses along the North and along Auman Drive need better definition and this should be designated on the plan. Leo commented that he was less concerned with three to four stories along Keystone and was more concerned with what happens along the neighborhood and what the people of the neighborhood end up with. Leo asked the petitioner to write in uses and height restrictions.

Steve Fehribach, traffic engineer with A & F Engineers, commented that the petitioners intended to maintain the same character of the roads in the area.

Mike Hollibaugh noted that a landscape median might be an option—it would break up the monotony.

Matt Griffin added that a boulevard treatment allows control of access points.

Mark Rattermann asked how many residential units would be included in the development.

David Leazenby responded that there were no numbers yet and that nothing has been described in the ordinance.

Mark Rattermann clarified that he was asking for an approximation.

Leo Dierckman commented that the newspapers had been reporting around 2000 residential units.

Mark Rattermann asked what the status of the ground to the South is.

David Leazenby responded that the Fountains building is not owned by Buckingham, but that the area along Carmel Drive in front of the Fountains is owned by Buckingham.

Mark Rattermann noted that with the circulation plan as presented, Auman Drive is being used as the cut through; 126th street may need a traffic light in order to preserve public safety.

Discussion ensued regarding eminent domain and TIF districts.

Mark Rattermann commented that the Mayor has repeatedly said that the downtown area has no identity. It is a question whether or not this much commercial should be built away from the downtown area. One could make the philosophical argument that this development opposes the creation of the downtown area. On the other hand, it would be good to see something cool built in this area.

David Leazenby said that Buckingham set out to make this development a predominantly residential neighborhood to complement the City Center. The density would probably be higher than some of the surrounding areas.

Leo Dierckman said that if the development was to be a predominantly residential neighborhood, then he thought that the commercial uses should be more ancillary uses to the residential in the neighborhood. It would be hard to fill three million square feet with coffee shops.

Mark Rattermann commented that he was totally uncomfortable using TIFs to build roads inside a development.

Susan Westermeier said that she struggles with the timing factor and feels like they are making a lot of assumptions.

Leo Dierckman said that it obviously couldn't be approved without some contingencies.

David Leazenby responded that there are some limitations in the timing of development without all of the access points being available—that is understood. However, there is some room for development without all of the access points established.

Leo Dierckman requested that the petitioner break it into quadrants to make it a little easier to comprehend and review. Leo asked the petitioners to really focus on the West side of the development, so that the neighbors know exactly what they are going to get.

Susan Westermeier agreed and said the petitioner really needs to stage a plan.

David Leazenby said he would talk with the City DOCS staff.

Leo Dierckman felt that the petitioner had received a lot of good comments from the neighbors this evening and asked that those comments be incorporated for the next meeting.

Mark Rattermann said that when the Committee and the Plan Commission consider regional transportation, they are thinking in terms of 10, 20, or 30 years out and they do not make these decisions casually. Mark recommended that the petitioner incorporate a concealed cell phone tower in the proposed tower of the development.

Leo Dierckman instructed the petitioner to redline a copy of the PUD ordinance and submit to the Committee for easier review. The Special Studies Committee will have a special meeting to go through the PUD Ordinance line-by-line. The special meeting will be held, tentatively, on April 27, 2006. The petitioner should add information about phasing into the language of the PUD Ordinance.

Matt Griffin announced that as soon as a meeting room could be verified and booked, the Agenda for the special meeting would be posted online.

...END...

---5 minute break---

7. Docket No. 05110020 DP/ADLS: Old Meridian Place

The applicant seeks to create 129 townhomes and a mix of office and retail uses on 25 acres.

The site is located at 12852 Old Meridian Street and is zoned OM/SFA.

Filed by Jon Isaacs for Centex Homes.

Present for the Petitioner: Jim Shinaver, representing Centex Homes and Jon Isaacs with Centex Homes.

Petitioner's Presentation: **Jon Isaacs** said that the request has been modified to Old Meridian Mixed Use Zoning. He said that essentially Buildings 4 and 5 would not be permitted without the rezoning. He said that they are seeking architectural approval for building 5 and 4 and for the townhome areas. He said that they were looking for a partner to come in and design the Commercial sections of the development. He passed out copies of the site plan. He said that they are looking for site plan approval and approval of their street connections. He said that the townhome portion of the development would be the Georgetown Series. He noted that the staff report addresses the monotony of the architecture. He said that they were considering modifying the Georgetown product by removing the brick and adding some hearty plank and adding covered parking. He said that finalized landscape plans would be filed with DOCS. He said that they would go back to TAC and would work with the Engineering Department to be sure that all issues were resolved. He said that Centex is trying to coordinate the building of the loop road with the other parties involved by incorporating one design and one construction project. He said that after meeting with the pastor of the church in the area, he is confident that this plan will afford them some flexibility to make some decisions about expansion in the future without affecting Centex's timeline.

Matt Griffin asked Jon Isaacs if he had more insight about how those parcels along Old Meridian would be handled

Jon Isaacs said that at this time he is looking at an ADLS only. He said that they are thinking that they wouldn't want to create the parking, but that the underground detention area is going to be there.

Matt Griffin noted that the distance of the buildings from the street didn't look very urban along Old Meridian.

Jon Isaacs responded that once the angled parking becomes straight parking, the buildings should come forward.

Matt Griffin told the petitioner to verify that with the Engineering Department—Centex would have to look at establishing a build-to line. Are these details that need to get nailed down now?

Jon Isaacs He said that he would like to keep the design of the buildings and sites open ended because Centex is not the experts of commercial development and that he doesn't want to lock their partner who will be developing the commercial into something too soon.

Matt Griffin said that it might make sense to add some permeability to keep pedestrians from walking by a blank wall. Matt suggested using materials such as glass blockings, etc.

Christine Barton-Holmes asked the petitioner if the garages were at grade.

Jon Isaacs responded that the slab was on grade and that they were using wood-frame construction.

Christine Barton-Holmes told the petitioner that the front entrance should be more clearly delineated.

Leo Dierckman commented that the petitioner should tie in the rooflines.

Matt Griffin noted that there is no detailed landscape plan. Matt asked how the alcoves made sense. Matt would like to see a finalized site plan before this item goes before the TAC committee. The townhome architecture does not seem very different.

Leo Dierckman asked that the petitioner consider some of the Gramercy building design. Leo liked the architecture of Building 5.

Matt Griffin said he would treat the next submittal as the final project to get the petitioner an actual and complete set of comments.

Sue Westermeier asked the petitioner what the price range of the townhomes would be.

Jon Isaacs responded that no construction costs were finalized yet, but the price range hoped for would be in the range of \$170s to the 250s for the Condo flats and townhomes would range between \$225, to \$300,000.

Jim Shinaver clarified that the project would be coming back to Committee for the May 4, 2006 meeting. The petitioner would be submitting complete revised packets with everything for the May 4, 2006 meeting and would set up a separate meeting with Scott Brewer.

Mark Rattermann commented that normally, units are not put over the common space—this is an interesting concept and Mark was excited to see how it goes. Mark was not opposed to the other elevation and liked the architecture of Building 4. Mark thought the entrance would “pop out.”

Jim Shinaver added that the Northern portion would have a different type of architecture than the Southern portion of the development.

...END...

8. Docket No. 05120026 Z and 05120027 DP/ADLS: Village Green PUD

The applicant seeks to rezone 9.42 acres from R2/Residential to PUD/Planned Unit Development for the purpose of creating 50 townhomes.

The site is located 211 W. Smokey Row Rd.

Filed by Jim Shinaver of Nelson and Frankenberger for Bay Development Co. and Drees Premiere Homes Inc.

Present for the Petitioner: Jim Shinaver, Nelson and Frankenberger; John Talbot, Drees Homes; Steve Fehribach, A&F Engineering; Jud Scott, Vine & Branch; John Lapp, Kevin Parsons, and Jim Shields, Weihe Engineers.

Petitioner's Presentation: **Jim Shinaver** said that the project was a Rezone with DP/ADLS running congruently. Full brochures were submitted for the February 21, 2006 meeting and supplemental brochures for the March 30, 2006 meeting. The petitioner feels that he has made a lot of progress since the last Committee meeting.

John Talbot said that they had met with the mayor to discuss the architecture of the rear of the townhomes that would face the Monon. The petitioner has agreed to add brick and color to the rear of the townhomes in order to present a very nice rear elevation and appearance to one looking at the townhomes from the Monon. The current site plan is on tab 2 of the March 30, 2006 supplemental brochures; the dark green area is a tree conservation area. There is also a detention pond shown—there is only one pond serving the development, but an additional pond could be added if necessary. The petitioner is interested in preserving as many trees as possible. The petitioner is aware of the neighbors' concerns regarding the tree status of the site and the petitioner is trying to be very sensitive to those concerns. The number of townhomes has been reduced to forty-eight units. Immediately to the south is an apartment community. The petitioner has talked with the Engineering Department about how traffic will flow. The Engineering and Fire Department are comfortable with the inclusion of brick pavers to allow for emergency access. There is a nice-size sycamore tree on the site; Jud Scott and Scott Brewer have determined that the tree could be preserved.

John Talbot further stated that he would go through some of the issues listed in the Department Report to up-date the Committee on the status of those items. The petitioner has already held follow-up meetings with the Department of Engineering—the traffic analysis met their requirements but there were still a few issues being worked through—generally, Engineering approved of the primary plat. The traffic study was completed when school was in session to make sure that the development dealt with that scenario. Revised landscape have been submitted and the petitioner is working with Scott Brewer for approval of the landscape plan.

Jim Shields with Weihe Engineers has responded to a number of the TAC comments and it is possible that some of the issues that Gary Duncan noted have already been addressed. The petitioner has discussed the connection to the Monon Trail with the Parks Department and they are now more open. The petitioner is committing to provide a connection and will work with staff and the Parks Department to firm that and to show it on the plan.

Jud Scott discussed the trees that would be saved and the trees that would be removed.

Matt Griffin noted that the flood plain area of the site couldn't be built on, but that it can be counted as part of the site. Engineering seems to be on board with what has been presented. The petitioner would be responsible for building his half of 136th street or making monetary commitments in lieu of completing the improvements to thoroughfare plan standards. The petitioner would be responsible for creating a pedestrian crossing over Little Cool Creek as required by the Alternative Transportation Plan instead of stopping the path when it got to the creek. As far as the architecture was concerned, they originally saw the color variation mimicked in brick on the back as well.

Leo Dierckman said that he thinks that the Committee would like to see the architecture of the townhomes facing the Monon across the backs of all of the townhomes across the board.

John Talbot responded that the intent with the new architecture is to match the fronts with the back. John Talbot noted that a remonstrator had asked for more earth tones.

Sue Westermeier asked if the architecture could be used on all of the townhomes.

John Talbot said that he would commit to using them on all of the townhomes.

Discussion ensued regarding the color schemes presented as part of the architecture of the different elevations.

Leo Dierckman called for organized public comments—unfavorable.

Kurt Jaenicke noted that with the FEMA flood plain map, there is only one way to develop this property. Kurt said that he and the Committee had previously requested a wetlands study, which had not been completed. Kurt expressed concern that Scott Brewer was looking for a tree survey and that it has never been done. Kurt referred to the Wetlands Delineation Act and said that the petitioners had no permit to build in the floodway.

Jenny Chastain said that she had questioned the traffic study at the meeting; she had seen a three-page document that made some references to “if a turn lane is installed” or “if a roundabout is installed”. Jenny said that the area is already a busy area; she is still waiting to see a detailed traffic report.

Jim Shinaver noted that a complete traffic report is part of the file.

Jenny Chastain said that her second question is about impact on the Monon. Looking at “Traditions on the Monon,” the buildings have been constructed closer to the Monon than the developers had stated. Jenny also said that a lot more trees were cut down than the developers had promised. Ms. Chastain said she had concerns about developers who come out and promise things and don’t follow through—this is a very special piece of land becoming a tunnel of concrete. Where will the wildlife that currently reside on the property go when development occurs. Ms. Chastain encouraged the City to make this piece of property a park—she and others are willing to find and raise the support to build a park there—there are businesses that would donate to the cause. Why is it necessary to change the density of the land and to also change the zoning of the property? Why do these things even need to be considered on this particular green space. Ms. Chastain noted that the Committee had asked for a wetlands study in the past—the developers still have not addressed this issue.

Denise Howell commented that her career is as a relocation director in Carmel and she has been a resident of Old Town for 20 years. Ms. Howell said that she is not opposed to progress but that healthy growth is measured by quality not quantity. She posed the question, “What is going to be left in Old Town if everything is new?” There are another 2500 townhomes in Carmel awaiting approval and Ms. Howell is concerned about the negative impact the development of all of these townhomes will have on the Carmel community. On the average, single-family homes in Carmel stay on the market 66 days; townhomes for sale average about 2.5 times that long on the market and even then, the sales sometimes consist of under priced units. According to a 2004 Runzheimer Report, DINKS (or Double-Income, No Kids) move about every three years—this means that statistically, the townhomes will come back on the market every three to five years. What will happen when the townhomes don’t sell? Would the owners of the townhomes be forced to sell them or would they have the option of making them a rental? She pointed out that in addition to the single-family units, the townhomes would also compete with the apartments in the area. Indiana is one of the top five states for foreclosures and there are 715 homes in Carmel that are being foreclosed on. The residents of Carmel are relying on the Committee members; simply stated, the residents believe that this is way too much, too fast.

Rebuttal, Jim Shinaver: Staff mentioned that Scott Brewer had received John Lapp’s revised information and that Scott is comfortable with the plan as presented. As far as the request for the wetlands study, there has been no request made by Staff or Engineering and wetlands is not an issue on this site. The property is currently zoned R-2 and some of the trees would be affected with the proposal as presented or with an R-2 development. Jim said he would have Steve Fehribach with A & F Engineering, traffic engineer and consultant, make a complete copy of the traffic study to be kept in the file at the Department of Community Services office for public review.

Leo Dierckman asked how far the buildings were going to be from the Monon.

Jim Shields responded that they were 56.5 feet from the rear of the buildings to the pavement; the closest building to the Monon is 43.5 feet in his measurement.

Mark Rattermann commented that he didn't really like the architecture because he doesn't like front-load garages. Mark asked the petitioner to explore having some front-load and rear-load garages. The parcels not on the Monon could possibly be rear-load garages. Mark clarified that the streets will be dedicated. Mark said he would insist that the petitioner remove the deed restriction relating to the hours of usage of the Monon (dawn to dusk).

John Talbot said that they would commit to doing that.

Leo Dierckman said the Committee would not vote on this item until the petitioner had a Monon connection in place and shown on the plans.

Matt Griffin said that as far as a wetlands study, he would have to defer to Scott Brewer and Engineering on that issue.

Mike Hollibaugh added that John South with Hamilton County evaluates that.

Jud Scott said that there has never been a tree inventory done on the property.

John Talbot said that they would do a tree survey and that they would hire a consultant to complete a wetlands study on the property.

Jenny Chastain commented that if structures are built within a wetlands area, there is a huge fine. Ms. Chastain said she does not live around the property.

...END...

9. Docket No. 06010008 Z: Midtown Village PUD

The applicant seeks to rezone 18.82 acres from I1/Industrail to PUD for the purpose of creating mixed use development.

The site is located at 510 Third Avenue SW and is zoned I1/Industrial.

Filed by Lawrence Kemper of Nelson and Frankenberger for Centex Homes.

Present for the Petitioner: Larry Kemper and Jim Shinaver with Nelson and Frankenberger, and Jon Isaacs with Centex Homes.

Petitioner's Presentation: **Jon Isaacs** said that he is happy to extend the City property into the proposal. He said that they now have Shannon Door under contract and hope to extend to the South. He said that the reason for the petition is that they are trying to lock in some of the Architecture early because taking that into production would be a 12-14 month process and that their target date to begin construction on the building is July 2007. The first story is the retail component, with the larger condo building adjacent to the Monon. The petitioner was trying to keep the building height lower on the Monon side to minimize massing. The architects provided elevations of three sides of the building—one layer of parking with residential construction above; no unit would look directly out to where the water tower is located. The product is going

to be a luxury townhome; there will only be twelve of those units in the first phase. The price point for the luxury townhomes would be significantly more because they will have direct access to the Monon. This evening, the petitioner is asking for feedback on the structural elements of the architecture and will return to Committee with the schematics of the design of the architecture of the building.

Jim Shinaver said that the PUD ordinance has also been reformatted and that they would like some feedback and responses on the PUD. One thing not reflected is the need for a temporary sales-type office.

Jon Isaacs said that as they get further into the planning of the PUD, they would be hiring an urban infill company out of Chicago to specialize in pre-selling the building. The sales office would exist for two to three years. Within the next thirty days, the petitioner will have more information about the marketing company from Chicago.

Leo Dierckman commented that a company he previously worked for would use modular buildings for sales offices and upon completion of the sales, would donate them to Churches.

Discussion ensued regarding temporary sales office.

Matt Griffin said that the Department is awaiting final engineering approval as well as Scott Brewer's approval for the landscape plan. The Department requests that this item be heard again at the next Committee meeting.

Sue Westermeier said that she had some concern about the height.

Jim Shinaver pointed out that I-1 permits sixty-foot tall buildings.

Leo Dierckman commented that he liked the architecture of the building.

Jim Shinaver said that the height of the building also helps to shield and screen the view of the water tower.

Mark Rattermann referred to discussion going around that this will have a TIF associated with it. Mark said the petitioner would need to remove the deed restriction relating to the hours of usage of the Monon (dawn to dusk).

Jim Shinaver said that the petition would be back at the May 4, 2006 Committee meeting.

...END...

10. Docket No. 06020015 ADLS: Evan Lurie Building – Parcel 21

The applicant seeks to create a 4 story mixed use building on .14 acres.

The site is located at 30 West Main St. and is zoned B1 within the Old Town Overlay

Filed by Kevin Sellers of CSO Schenkel Shultz for the Carmel Redevelopment Commission.

This item was heard third on the agenda.

Present for the Petitioner: Mike Hollibaugh from the Carmel Department of Community Services representing the Carmel Redevelopment Commission.

Petitioner's Presentation: Mike Hollibaugh addressed the Committee in Les Olds' absence.

The Evan Lurie building is a four-story building that would be located in Old Town sandwiched between the Carmel Antique mall and the music building. The building would have a four-sided brick wrap with some intricate detailing on the front façade. The petitioner had to obtain two variances for building height, one for the B-1 zoning classification and one for the Old Town Overlay. Both of the variances were approved at the March meeting of the Board of Zoning Appeals. At this time, the Department is recommending approval a—Committee approval only is required.

Mark Rattermann wanted to discuss the height of the building—the Ordinance only allows three stories. Mark was concerned that by approving this request, it would be the beginning of everyone else wanting four stories also.

Leo Dierckman did not think that would be the case.

Mark Rattermann said he believed there is a TIF associated with this project and that funding goes to the Arts Center. Mark said that Rick (Sharpe?) spoke to this being part of the Performing Arts Center—could this be clarified?

Mark Rattermann made formal **motion to approve** docket number 06020015 ADLS: Evan Lurie Building – Parcel 21, seconded by Susan Westermeier, approved 3-0.

...END...

The meeting was adjourned at 11:02 p.m.

Leo Dierckman, Chairperson

Laura DeVore, Secretary Pro Tem

